



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/043,876

01/10/2002

George Chanos

CHANOS.001CP1

7701

20995

7590

07/01/2009

Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

MYHRE, JAMES W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3688

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/01/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com

eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/043,876	Applicant(s) CHANOS ET AL.	
	Examiner JAMES W. MYHRE	Art Unit 3688	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8,11-20 and 24-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,11-20 and 24-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on March 25, 2009. The Amendment amended Claims 1 and 26, but did not add nor cancel any claims. Thus the currently pending claims considered below remain Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-20, and 24-26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is directed to “*A feature rich advertisement to be displayed on a consumer computing device, the feature rich advertisement comprising: a consumer computer displaying an advertisement*”...“*the consumer computer configured to display a plurality of consumer-selectable request options*”...“*and the consumer computer additionally displaying visible identifying indicia associated generally with respect to said advertisement*”.

It is unclear how the advertisement comprises a consumer computer. It is also unclear on whether the “consumer computing device” in the preamble is the same “consumer computer” found in the body of the claim or a different device. Additionally, it is unclear on whether the feature rich advertisement in the preamble of the claim is the same advertisement found in the body of the claim since the first line of the first feature within the body of the claim identifies the advertisement as “an advertisement”, not “said advertisement”. This also raises antecedent basis questions about the use of “said advertisement” in the rest of the claim and the dependent claims.

Since an advertisement by itself is merely non-functional data per se and would be considered to be non-statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101, the Examiner will consider the claim during this Office Action to be a system claim wherein the system comprises a consumer computer and a computer program that causes the computer to display the feature rich advertisement, etc. It is recommended that the Applicant amend the claim to clearly identify the statutory class of the invention.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3688

5. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 12, 13, 15, 17-20, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scroggie et al (6,014,634) in view of Perttunen (6,359,635).

Claims 1 and 15: Scroggie discloses a method and advertisement (system), comprising:

- a. displaying an advertisement on a browser of a consumer computer, wherein the advertisement includes one or more interactive symbols that the consumer make select to request additional information (column 1, line 56 - column 2, line 4; column 3, lines 15-24; and column 6, lines 10-14);
- b. receiving a selection from the consumer requesting additional information (column 1, line 56 – column 2, line 4; column 3, lines 15-24; and column 6, lines 34-38) designating an email address (column 6, lines 42-45); and
- c. sending the information to the email address (column 12, lines 55-58 and column 13, lines 7-10 and 31-40).

While Scroggie discloses selectable symbols within the advertisement for requesting additional information, it is not explicitly disclosed that the requests are hidden from view until the advertisement is activated by the consumer. However, Perttunen discloses a similar method and system for displaying advertisements that include non-visible areas (column 21, lines 17-39 and column 33, lines 9-14) which become visible when the consumers select (mouse-over) the area (column 19, lines 61-65 and column 21, lines 40-67). The consumers may click on the now visible symbol to

Art Unit: 3688

request additional information (column 21, lines 17-39). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Scroggie to use such “hidden” areas associated with the interactive symbols within the advertisement that allow the consumer to request additional information. One would have been motivated to hide these requests for information behind Scroggie’s interactive symbols in order to de-clutter the display, thus enabling the consumer to see and read the advertisement. The Examiner further notes that using a mouse-over technique to display hidden lists, menus, options, and information has been common since at least the mid-1990s.

Claim 2: Scroggie and Perttunen disclose the system as in Claim 1 above, and Scroggie further discloses the email address entered by the consumer (column 6, lines 42-45).

Claims 3-5 and 17-20: Scroggie and Perttunen disclose the method and system as in Claims 1 and 15 above, and Scroggie further discloses upon selection of a request for information redirecting the consumer to a supplier of the promotion or provider of the promotion (i.e. advertiser)(column 1, line 56- column 2, line 4; column 3, lines 15-24; and column 7, lines 49-51) to receive additional information such as discounts, new releases, catalogs, special offers, etc. (column 2, lines 8-47; column 3, lines 51-65; and column 6, lines 38-43).

Art Unit: 3688

Claims 6 and 24: Scroggie and Perttunen disclose a method and system as in Claim 1 above, and Perttunen further discloses mousing-over the indicia in the advertisement to activate the request (column 19, lines 61-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Scroggie to use the well known "mousing-over" technique to display and activate the requests for information. One would have been motivated to use the mouse-over technique in order to de-clutter the display, thus enabling the consumer to see and read the advertisement.

Claims 8, 9, 25, and 26: Scroggie and Perttunen disclose a method and system as in Claims 6 and 24 above, and Perttunen further discloses displaying the option on top of the advertisement or in a separate window, thus allowing either partial or full view of the advertisement and option at the same time (column 27, lines 21-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Scroggie to display the selectable options so as to only partial cover or not cover at all the advertisement. One would have been motivated to cover at the most only part of the advertisement in order to allow the consumer to cross-check the additional information with the information in the advertisement.

Claim 12: Scroggie and Perttunen disclose a system as in Claim 1 above, and Scroggie further discloses the indicia includes a logo or mark of the source (column 11, lines 2-5),

Art Unit: 3688

Claim 13: Scroggie and Perttunen disclose a system as in Claim 1 above, and Scroggie further discloses at least one selection mechanism (e.g. mouse or keyboard) for selecting the request option (column 1, line 56 - column 2, line 4).

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scroggie et al (6,014,634) in view of Perttunen (6,359,635) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rangan et al (6,006,265).

Claim 11: Scroggie and Perttunen disclose a system as in Claim 1 above, but do not explicitly disclose that the indicia is an animated object. However, Rangan discloses a similar system for displaying advertisement with hidden selectable options in which the advertisement and selectable options are hypervideos (e.g. animated objects) (column 26, lines 44-60). The Examiner also notes that animated icons/symbols on webpages have been known and used in the art since at least the early 1990's to draw the users attention to the icon/symbol. Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention fir Scroggie to use animated objects in order to entice the consumer to request more information.

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scroggie et al (6,014,634) in view of Perttunen (6,359,635) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Wexler (5,960,409).

Art Unit: 3688

Claim 14: Scroggie and Perttunen disclose the system as in Claim 1 above, but do not explicitly disclose that the advertisement is a banner advertisement. However, Wexler discloses a similar system for presenting advertisement with selectable options to request additional information in which the advertisement is a banner advertisement (column 1, lines 49-60 and column 3, lines 55-58). Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Scroggie to use banner advertisements for his invention. One would have been motivated to use banner advertisements in view of their wide spread use on the Internet to entice consumers while they are browsing without covering up their viewing screen.

8. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scroggie et al (6,014,634) in view of Perttunen (6,359, 635) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Official Notice.

Claim 16: Scroggie and Perttunen disclose a system as in Claim 1 above and Scroggie further discloses the consumer entering the email address to which the requested information will be sent. However, it is not explicitly disclosed that the email address is of an acquaintance of the consumer. First, the Examiner notes that if the consumer in Scroggie is entering an email address other than his own, then he must know or at least be somewhat acquainted with the email address owner (even if all he knows about the owner is his email address). Second, no patentable weight is given to who owns the email account to which the information is being sent. And third, Official Notice is taken

Art Unit: 3688

that it is old and well known within the arts for consumers to refer friends, relatives, and acquaintances to businesses. For example, many brides-to-be set up gift wish-lists at specific merchants listing their desired wedding gifts. They then send notification to their invitees of the merchant and his website. Their invitees may then go to the website, retrieve the wish-list which includes links (hidden or otherwise) to the products selected by the bride-to-be. Other links allow the invitee to maneuver through the site, annotated one of more items for purchase, and conclude the purchase transaction. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Scroggie to allow the consumer to enter another person's email address. One would have been motivated to allow the consumer to enter in the email address of other acquaintances in order to provide information to someone who may be more interested in the advertised product, thus increasing the chance that a purchase will be made.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11-20, and 24-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAMES W. MYHRE whose telephone number is (571)272-6722. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 6:00-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. W. M./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3688
June 28, 2009

/James W Myhre/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3688

Application/Control Number: 10/043,876
Art Unit: 3688

Page 11